

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **March 28, 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. The specification was objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (USPN 6,275,848, hereinafter "Arnold") in view of what is well known in the art in further view of Beck et al (USPN 5,903,723, hereinafter "Beck") in further view of Young et al (USPN 6,243,466 hereinafter "Young"). Claims 3-5, 8, 13-15, 18, 23-25, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of what is well known in the art, Beck and Young, and in further view of Eldridge et al (USPN 6,397,261, hereinafter "Eldridge"). Claims 6, 16, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of what is well known in the art, Beck and Young, in further view of Pollack (USPN 6,505,236, hereinafter "Pollack") in further view of Trenbeath et al. (USPN 6,324,587, hereinafter "Trenbeath") in further view of Birrell et al. (USPN 6,092,101, hereinafter "Birrell"). Claims 7, 17 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of what is well known in the art, Beck and Young, and in further view of Birrell.

Objections to the specification

The specification was objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the paragraph that was added at page 8, line 9, correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicant has also corrected a typographical error in the same paragraph. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 8, 18, and 28 were rejected as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of what is well known in the art, Beck and Young, and in further view of Eldridge. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of

Arnold, Beck, Young, and Eldridge teaches replacing an attachment with the storage location and filename of the attachment **when the attachment is identified** (see Eldridge, col. 7, lines 41-58).

In contrast, the present invention **requests permission** to replace the attachment with a location for the attachment prior to replacing the attachment (see page 10, line 25 to page 11, line 2 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows the sender to determine whether it is advantageous to replace the attachment and prevent the replacement if it is not advantageous to replace it. There is nothing within Arnold, Beck, Young, or Eldridge, either separately or in concert, which suggests requesting permission to replace the attachment with a location for the attachment prior to replacing the attachment.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention requests permission to replace the attachment with a location for the attachment prior to replacing the attachment. These amendments find support on page 10, line 25 to page 11, line 2 of the instant application. Dependent claims 8, 18, and 28 have been canceled without prejudice.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7 and 9-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-17 and 19-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-27 and 29-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: May 5, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665